

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. The Office Action rejected Claims 2-3, 6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Office Action also rejected Claims 1-4, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Finally, the Office Action rejected Claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicant has cancelled Claims 4, and 11. Applicant has also amended Claims 1-6, and 8-11. Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18 are now pending. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection of Claims 2-3, 6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The office Action rejected Claims 2-3, 6, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Specifically, the Office Action stated that claims 2 and 6 are indefinite because it is unclear which slide is being referred to. Applicant has amended Claims 2 and 6 to recite that at least one of the slides is referred to. The Office Action also stated that Claims 3 and 9 do not provide antecedent basis for "the horizontal plane" and "the carousel," respectively. Applicant has amended Claims 3 and 9 to provide antecedent basis for the respective elements. Accordingly, the Office Action rejection of Claims 2-3, 6, and 9-11 is overcome by the amendments to the claims.

Rejection of Claims 1-4, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4 and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,921,343 to Ushiro et al. ("Ushiro"). Specifically, the Office Action states that since the claims, as presented, have no limitations drawn to the simultaneous projection of the slides Ushiro discloses all elements of Claims 1-4 and 7-8.

Ushiro does not disclose a slide projector having means to rotate at least one of the slides. Furthermore, the Ushiro patent does not disclose a slide projector having means to provide an air flow to effect negative pressure below the slides to retain the slides in their respective position as recited by the amended claims. This negative pressure, which is formed below the slides, retains the slides in position. During rotation, a moved slide may become displaced, thereby requiring refocusing of the image. The invention as recited by the amended claims obviated this need since the low pressure draws the slide into the precise position required for proper image focus. Accordingly, Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are allowable over Ushiro for at least this reason.

Rejection of Claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claims 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Ushiro. Specifically, the Office Action stated that Claims 12-18 merely recite an intended use for the projector and fails to distinguish the structure of the invention from the structure disclosed by Ushiro.

Claims 12-18 depend from independent Claim 1. As discussed above, Claim 1 is allowable over Ushiro. Therefore Claims 12-18 are allowable over Ushiro at least by their depending from allowable Claim 1.

Objection to Claim 5

The Office Action objected to Claim 5 as being dependent on a rejected base claim. The Office Action further stated that Claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has rewritten Claim 5 to include all of the limitations of base Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 5 is allowable.

SUMMARY

In view of the forgoing supporting remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of pending Claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-18. This application is now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

If the Examiner wishes to direct any questions concerning this application to the undersigned Applicant's representative, please call the number indicated below.

Dated: October 21, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



Guy Perry
Reg. No. 46,194

Attorney for Applicant
(212) 735-3000
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP
Four Times Square
New York, NY 10036